



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Haw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,903	04/11/2001	Lory D. Molesky	50277-1004	8571
7590	11/21/2005			
Ditthavong & Carlson, P.C. Suite A 10507 Braddock Rd Fairfax, VA 22032			EXAMINER	STORK, KYLE R
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/829,903	MOLESKY, LORY D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kyle R. Stork	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendments submitted 23 September 2005.
2. Claims 1-8 and 10-24 are pending. Claims 1, 11-12, 17 and 21 are independent claims. Claim 9 is cancelled. The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-24 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screenshots from www.iwu.edu/~lshapiro, via Web Archive (web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.iwu.edu/~lshapiro), December 06, 1998, hereafter Screenshots and further in view of Myers et al. (US 5581677, patented 3 December 1996, hereafter Myers).

As per independent claim 1, Screenshots disclose a computer-readable medium bearing instructions in a markup language for interactively presenting information to a user, the instructions arranged, upon processing by a rendering agent, to cause one or more processors execution the rendering agent to perform the steps of:

Art Unit: 2178

- Displaying simultaneously a first data and a second data on a web page (Figure 1, items 1 and 2)
- Setting a plurality of active regions on the first data wherein each active region is responsive to an event and performs an action in response to the event (Figure 1, item 1: Here, several active regions (links) are shown. When a link is selected, a new data is displayed in the place of the second data (Figure 2, item 3))
- Detecting an event relating to the first chart (Figures 1-2: Here, when a link is selected by a user, a new data is displayed in the place of the second data)
- In response to the event relating to the first data, performing the action of replacing the second data with a third data so as to display simultaneously the first data and the third data on the web page (Figures 1-2)

Screenshots fail to specifically disclose wherein the data is a chart. Myers discloses a chart (column 1, lines 13-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Screenshots with Myers, since it would have allowed a user to access multiple charts via a menu chart.

As per dependent claim 2, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further discloses the event includes a cursor control event relating to one of the active regions (Figure 1, item 1: Here, several active regions (links) are shown. When a link is selected, a new data is displayed in the place of the second data (Figure 2, item 3)).

As per dependent claim 3, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further discloses selecting a third data from the plurality of data based on the one of the active regions indicated by the cursor control event (Figures 2, item 1: Here, the user selects a third data from the active region (link)).

As per dependent claim 4, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further discloses:

- Detecting another cursor control event, wherein the other cursor control event relates to another one of the active regions (Figures 2-3)
- In response to the other cursor control event, performing the steps of:
 - Selecting a fourth chart from the plurality of charts based on the other of the active regions indicated by the other cursor control event (Figures 2-3)
 - Replacing the third chart with the fourth data so as to display simultaneously the first data and the fourth data on the web page (Figure 3, item 4)

As per dependent claim 5, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further disclose wherein the event includes a movement of a cursor over the first data, a movement of the cursor out of the first data, or a click when the cursor is positioned over the first data (Figures 1-3: Here, when a user clicks on an active region (link), the event occurs).

As per dependent claim 6, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further discloses receiving content and styling information for the first data, second data, and the third data; generating the instructions in the markup language based on the content and styling information for the first data, second data, and third data; and embodying the instructions in the computer-readable medium (Figures 1-3: Here, the data is in the HTML markup language, which is rendered by the web browser. This information is also available on the Internet, a computer-readable medium).

As per dependent claim 7, Screenshots and Myers disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further discloses making the computer-readable medium accessible to the computer system and executing the rendering agent to load and render the information in accordance with the instructions in the markup language (Figures 1-3).

As per independent claim 17, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. The only noticeable difference is that claim 17 teaches more instances of replacing data on a web page. The method of claim 1 allows for multiple frames to be simultaneously displayed and replaced. Claim 17 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses receiving content and styling information for data on the web, similar to claim 6. Claim 18 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

5. Claims 8, 10-12, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screenshots and Myers and further in view of Michaud et al. (US 2002/0052891, filed 10 April 1998, hereafter Michaud).

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1, except the use of a map element and wherein the image elements reference data. Screenshots fails to disclose these limitations. However, Michaud discloses use of a map element wherein the image elements reference data (paragraph 0006).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Screenshots and Myers with Michaud, since it would have allowed a user to use image data in conjunction with links (Michaud: paragraph 0006).

As per dependent claim 10, Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 8, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots further disclose the replacing the second data with the third data is performed without loading another web page (Figures 1-3: Here, as the second data is replaced with the third data, the URL of the web page does not change).

As per independent claim 11, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 8. Claim 11 is similarly rejected under Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud.

As per independent claim 12, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11, except the use of a shape attribute specifying a geometry

Art Unit: 2178

for display on the single web page that overlaps at least part of the first data and does not overlap the second data. Michaud further discloses use of a shape attribute specifying a geometry for display on the single web page that overlaps at least part of the first data and does not overlap the second data (paragraphs 0006-0009: Here, hotspots are geometric areas that link to another data set. Hotspots are then overlapped with image data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud with Michaud, since it would have allowed a user to interact with image data (Michaud: paragraphs 0006-0009).

As per dependent claim 20, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claim 20 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 21, the applicant discloses the limitation substantially similar to those in claim 12. The applicant further includes a second image map referencing a second image to be rendered in a second area. The method further includes a second image map referencing a second image to be rendered in a second area is substantially similar to having a first image map referencing a first image to be rendered as disclosed by Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud. Claim 21 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to claim 17. Claim 22 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 13-16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud and further in view of Priester ("Mouse Over Magic," 2000, obtained from <http://www.efuse.com/clinic/mouseover/>).

As per dependent claim 13, Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. They fail to specifically disclose the event including a movement of a cursor into the geometry specified by the shape attribute. However, Priester discloses events including the movement of a cursor into the geometry specified by the shape attribute (pages 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Screenshots, Myers, and Michaud with Priester, since it would have allowed a user to view changes based upon the positioning of a cursor (Priester: page 1).

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 14 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 15, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 16, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 16 is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screenshots and Myers and further in view of Robotham et al. (US 6704024, filed 29 November 2000, hereafter Robotham).

As per dependent claim 23, Screenshots and Myers, disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Screenshots and Myers fail, to specifically disclose use of a DOM. However, Robotham discloses use of a DOM for rendering reference data (column 17, line 62- column 18, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Screenshots and Myers with Robotham, since it would have allowed a user to map representations between input fields and the representation of the visual element (Robotham: column 18, lines 6-15).

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screenshots, and Myers and further in view of Priester.

As per dependent claim 24, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13. Claim 24 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 10-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As disclosed above, the Screenshots reference has been added to address the applicant's amended limitations. Upon updating the search to include the amended limitations, the prior art above was discovered.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER